Docket No. 0925-0165P

Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2005

Art Unit: 2616

Page 7 of 11

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given

the present application. Claims 1-7 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 have been amended, and new claims 8-14 have been added.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections of and

objections to claims 1-7 in view of the amendments to the claims and the

remarks as set forth below.

Claim for Priority

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has recognized the

Applicants' claim for foreign priority. In view of the fact that Applicants' claim for

priority has been acknowledged, no additional action is required from the

Applicants at this time.

Acknowledgment of Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner has acknowledged the Information Disclosure Statement

filed on January 11, 2001. An Initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form has been

received from the Examiner. No further action is necessary at this time.

Docket No. 0925-0165P

Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2005

Art Unit: 2616 Page 8 of 11

Drawings

The Examiner has not acknowledged the acceptance of the drawings filed

on January 11, 2001. The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge

acceptance of the drawings in the next Office Action.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claim 4 which is dependent upon claim 3

is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and the intervening claims. Claim 4 has been rewritten in

independent form, and claim 4 should be in condition for allowance.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 3-7 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §

112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. More specifically, the Examiner has

indicated that "said display device" of claim 3 lacks an antecedent basis.

Accordingly, claim 3 has been amended to recite "a display device". The

Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection based upon 35

U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Docket No. 0925-0165P

Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2005

Art Unit: 2616

Page 9 of 11

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Fig. 2 of the present application, Applicants' Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA")", in view of U.S. Patent 5,307,173 (hereinafter referred to a "Yuen"). The Applicants have amended claim 1, and it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art.

The AAPA discloses a prior art VCR having a setup procedure, but the AAPA does not disclose an alarm device and a guided setup which is initiated in response to the alarm device. Moreover, the Yuen patent does not teach, show or suggest the recited features which are missing from the AAPA. The Yuen patent may disclose a red warning light (Fig. 15, 332) and menu setup screens, but there is no disclosure whatsoever that the setup screens are initiated in response to the red warning light. The red warning light 332 flashes while the instant programmer 300 of Yuen is sending a test signal to the VCR. (See col. 23, lines 10-37). Accordingly, even if the cited prior art references are combined, the resulting hypothetical combination would simply flash a red warning light when a test signal is being sent to the VCR, and the red warning light would not indicate a problem with the initial setup nor would it be used to initiate a guided setup. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Docket No. 0925-0165P

Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2005

Art Unit: 2616

Page 10 of 11

Claims 2, 3 and 5-7

Claims 2, 3 and 5-7 are dependent claims which depend from

independent claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3 and 5-7 are

allowable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the

claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone

or in combination.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the

present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Richard J.

McGrath (Reg. No. 29,195) at the telephone number of (703) 205-8000, to conduct

an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present

application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and

future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No.

U.S. Application No. 09/757,645 Docket No. 0925-0165P

Reply to Office Action of April 6, 2005

Art Unit: 2616

Page 11 of 11

02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

Ву

Michael K. Mutter, #29,680

MKM/R9M/kmr 0925-0165P P.O. Box 747 Falls Church, VA 22040-0747 (703) 205-8000